

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Restriction/Election

The Office considered **claims 1-21** of the application to be directed to three patentably distinct inventions. Specifically, the Examiner required election of a single invention, wherein the first invention is drawn to a plant having an absorber column (Group I, claims 1-8 and 21), the second invention is drawn to a plant having a dryer, a CO₂ source, and an absorber column (Group II, claims 9-14), and the third invention is drawn to a plant having a membrane separator, autorefrigeration unit, and combustion unit (Group III, claims 15-20). The applicant respectfully disagrees with the office's characterization. Nevertheless, the applicant elects *without traverse Group II*, reading on *claims 9-14*.


The office further considered that Group II would include three distinct species and argued that Species A would be according to Figure 4, Species B would be according to Figure 5, and Species C would be according to Figure 6-7. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the office's position, especially as no reasoning has been provided as to why the alleged species would be distinct. Nevertheless, the applicant elects *without traverse Species A*, reading on *claims 9-12*.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application, with claims 1-8 and 13-21 being withdrawn. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Fish & Associates, PC

By 
Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,697
Tel.: (949) 253-0944